



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/25/3374170

1 Stonemasons Yard, Wandsworth, London SW18 3NR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Alex Searle against the decision of Wandsworth Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/1591.
 - The proposed development is a second floor addition to an existing mansard roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have been provided with the official list entry for the Grade II listed entrance gates to Wandsworth cemetery. However, given the location of the proposed extension to the rear of the host, and the significant distance between the appeal site and those gates, their setting would not be harmed.
3. Having regard to the details of the proposal, whilst the appellant states that he would be willing to consider a minor design refinement if it is deemed necessary, I have determined the appeal based on the drawings which were before the Council and interested parties at application stage.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace, and the area; and
 - the living conditions of adjacent occupiers, with particular regard to the outlook from, and availability of natural light to, 2 Stonemasons Yard ('No 2').

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The host comprises the end property in a short terrace, which sits to the rear of an older red brick building fronting Magdalen Road. The terrace is three storeys high, with its second floor accommodation contained in a mansard roof. That mansard is set back slightly from the terrace's front face, and finishes well short of its flat roofed two storey rear projections. Given its consistent and regular form,

- proportions, fenestration and materials, the terrace has a rhythmical, very cohesive character, and it presents an attractive architectural composition.
6. The proposal would involve a second floor mansard roof extension over much of the host's flat-roofed rear projection, terminating just short of its rear parapet. Whilst its general style and materials would respect the host, and it would be set below its roofline, the scheme's form and depth would give this property's roof a much more complex, domineering and bulky appearance compared to the remainder of the terrace. In so doing, it would markedly disrupt the building's symmetry and cohesion.
 7. Although there would only be limited and partial views of the extension from Stonemasons Yard, given its elevated position, and notwithstanding trees, which may filter views to a greater degree when in leaf, I observed that its harmful impact would be clearly visible from Wandsworth cemetery, and when looking along the rear face of the terrace from Strickland Row.
 8. Thus, whilst nearby buildings are fairly diverse in terms of their scale and form, given the scheme's awkward design and its impact on this cohesive terrace, it would also harm the character and appearance of the area.
 9. The scheme would therefore conflict with Policies LP1, LP2 and LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan 2023-2038 (2023) ('WLP'). Amongst other things, and in general terms, these set out the need for a high quality, design-led approach which integrates with its surroundings and the host building, having regard to matters such as scale, massing, form, appearance and visual amenity.
 10. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's stance on good design; and with those parts of the Wandsworth Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2016 ('SPD') which advise that alterations and extensions should be sympathetic to the character of the house and should complement surrounding buildings, and that extensions over back additions should not upset the hierarchy of the rear addition.

Living conditions

11. No 2 has a first floor window which is set back relative to the two storey outriggers either side, and a window in its mansard roof. Having regard to the letter from Ferio Planning dated 30 June 2025 and from Right of Light Consulting dated 26 June 2025, those owners state that these serve a bedroom and a bathroom respectively. However, the assessment at paragraph 6.2 of the appellant's statement is based on the use of those rooms being the other way around.
12. Whilst the proposed mansard extension would project to the rear over the host's outrigger, it would be set in from the boundary with No 2, its roof would slope away from that property, and it would have a fairly limited height. In that context, irrespective of the use of the room, the impact on the outlook from, and the availability of natural light to, No 2's second floor window would be limited.
13. For similar reasons, and in the context of the existing relationship, it would not cause a harmful impact on the outlook from No 2's first floor window. However, given the limited and conflicting evidence before me, and as I cannot be certain whether or not that window serves a habitable room, I cannot reasonably assess if

the scheme would have a harmfully adverse impact on those occupiers due to the amount of natural light received within that room.

14. Thus, whilst I have had regard to the SPD's 'rule of thumb' that extensions should not project over more than 50% of a back addition; and I have considered the scheme against those parts of WLP Policy LP2 which seek to avoid unacceptable adverse impacts on neighbouring properties with reference to matters including daylight and sunlight, I cannot reach a meaningful conclusion on this matter.

Other considerations

15. In its favour, the scheme would provide additional space for the occupants and thereby improve living conditions within the host property.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

16. I have found that the scheme would have a significantly harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace, and the area. Whilst I have been unable to reach a meaningful conclusion with regards the scheme's impact on the adjoining occupiers, its largely private benefit would not outweigh the harm that it would cause.
17. Consequently, and having regard to all other matters raised, including representations by interested parties, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR